



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, DC 20231

08/825,102 03/27/97 GOLAN G 0866/0D108

DARBY & DARBY
805 THIRD AVENUE
NEW YORK NY 10022

LM02/1002

EXAMINER
NGUYEN, N

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER
2787 3

DATE MAILED: 10/02/98

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.
08/825,102

Applicant(s)
Gilad Goland

Examiner
Nguyen X. Nguyen

Group Art Unit
2787



☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.

☐ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire three month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claims

☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

☒ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been
☐ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____.

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____.

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

☒ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). 2

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

--- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---

Art Unit: 2787

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

1. The Examiner has considered the references listed in the Information Disclosure Statements submitted on 08/13/97 (see attached PTO-1449).

Specification

2. Claims 1-10 are presented for examination.
3. The rejections cited as stated below:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2787

5. Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kuznetsov et al. hereinafter Kuznetsov in view of Francisco et al. hereinafter Francisco.

As per claims 1, 3-4, and 5-10, Kuznetsov discloses a method of **intercepting** and **blocking** the dangerous request (see ref.fig. 5B, col. 7, lines 25-60) and **allowing** accesss (see ref.fig. 8, col 14, lines 43-63). However, Kuznetsov does not expressly teach the use of **security policy**. Francisco teaches such limitation (see ref.fig. 2A-B, col. 4, lines 25-31). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to employ Francisco's teachings within the system of Kuznetsov, because it would increase the security of the computer system from unauthorized access the hard disk. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Francisco with Kuznetsov to obtain the invention as specified in said claim.

As per claim 2, it is rejected applied as above in rejecting claim 1. Furthermore, Kuznetsov teaches the use of **security monitor** (see ref.fig. 1, col. 5, lines 45-60).

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

a) Olkin teaches 'Middleware Program With Enhanced Security',

b) Ault et al. teach 'Method and Apparatus For Creating A Security Environment For A User Task In A Client/Server System',

Art Unit: 2787

c) Angelo et al. teach 'Method and Apparatus For Providing Secure And Private Keyboard Communications In Computer Systems',

d) Ananda teaches 'Secure Software Rental System Using Continuous Asynchronous Password Verification',

e) Jacobs et al. teach 'Remote Password Administration For A Computer Network Among A Plurality Of Nodes Sending A Password Update Message To All Nodes And Updating On Authorized Nodes',

f) Woodring et al. teach 'Protected Mode Simulation Of A Real Mode Interrupt Based Programming Interface In A Computer System',

g) Miller et al. teach 'User Specific Intelligent Interface Which Intercepts And Either Replaces Or Passes Commands To A Data Identity And The Field Accessed',

h) Hershey et al. teach 'Network Security System And Method Using A Parallel Finite State Machine Adaptive Active Monitor And Responder',

i) Boitana teaches 'Apparatus And Method For Computer System Integrated Security'.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nguyen X. Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 306 9131.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 6:30 AM to 4:00 PM, Eastern Time. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Fridays or e-mailed at

nguyen.nguyen@uspto.gov.

Art Unit: 2787

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh, can be reached on (703) 305 9648.


8. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-9051.

EXAMINER

Nguyen X. Nguyen

Art Unit 2787

September 28, 1998


AYAZ R. SHEIKH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
GROUP 2700